

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MOSCOW 02537 191717Z

43

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 INRE-00

ERDE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 026527

O 191613Z FEB 76

FM AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 150

S E C R E T MOSCOW 2537

EXDIS

E.O. 11652: XGDS-3

TAGS: PARM, US, UR

SUBJECT: TTBT/PNE NEGOTIATIONS: REPORT OF PLENARY MEETING,
FEB 19. TTBT/PNE DELEGATION MESSAGE NO 64

1. SUMMARY. SOVIET SIDE QUERIED US ABOUT NEW TEXT FOR PARAS 3 AND 4 OF PROTOCOL ARTICLE VII REGARDING YIELD MEASURING AND SEISMIC EQUIPMENT. US SIDE SAID ELEMENT OF CHOICE IN SELECTION OF TWO SETS OF EQUIPMENT JUSTIFIED OMISSION OF PROVISION FOR EQUIPMENT EXAMINATION PERIOD BEFORE EXPLOSION AND OMISSION OF PROVISION FOR RETENTION BY HOST PARTY OF RECORDING EQUIPMENT FOR 30 DAYS AFTER EXPLOSION. SOVIET SIDE PRINCIPALLY CONCERNED OVER ISSUE OF RETENTION OF RECORDING EQUIPMENT AFTER EXPLOSION BY HOST PARTY. SAID RETENTION OF RECORDING EQUIPMENT FOR 30 DAYS AFTER EXPLOSION BY HOST PARTY WAS UNCONDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR THEM. US SIDE PROPOSED WITH RESPECT TO PARA 3 THAT FAMILIARIZATION EQUIPMENT BE RETURNED 90 DAYS BEFORE BEGINNING OF EMPLACEMENT INSTEAD OF 120 DAYS, WHICH SOVIET SIDE SAID WAS ACCEPTABLE. END SUMMARY.

2. STOESSEL BRIEFLY NOTED THAT US TEXTS FOR PARAS 3 AND 4 OF PROTOCOL ARTICLE VII (MOSCOW 2364 AND 2392) ARE BASED ON ACCEPTANCE OF SOVIET PROPOSAL THAT PARTY CARRYING OUT EXPLOSION MAKE CHOICE BETWEEN TWO IDENTICAL SETS OF EQUIPMENT AND THAT US TEXT WILL PROTECT BASIC RIGHTS OF BOTH SIDES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MOSCOW 02537 191717Z

3. MOROKHOV ASKED SIX QUESTIONS:

(-) WHY IN PARA 3 OF ARTICLE III MUST THE FAMILIARIZATION EQUIPMENT BE RETURNED IN 30 DAYS?

(B) WITH REFERENCE TO SUBPARA 3(B) OF ARTICLE III, WHAT IS EXTENT OF SEISMIC EQUIPMENT TO BE PROVIDED?

(C) WHY IN PARA 4 OF ARTICLE III DOES US TEXT SPECIFY PLACE AT WHICH EQUIPMENT IS TO BE DELIVERED, WHEN IN PREVIOUS US TEXT, PLACE WAS UNSPECIFIED?

(D) WHY DOES US TEXT LEAVE OUT PREVIOUS PROVISION FOR EXAMINATION OF EQUIPMENT AND REPLACE IT BY A PROVISION ONLY FOR DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIPMENT?

(E) WHY DOES US TEXT LEAVE OUT PREVIOUS PROVISION FOR RETENTION OF EQUIPMENT FOR RECORDING DATA BY HOST PARTY FOR 30 DAYS AFTER EXPLOSION AND NOW PROVIDE FOR IMMEDIATE RETURN OF EQUIPMENT?

(F) WHY DOES US TEXT LEAVE OUT ANY SPECIFIED TIME PERIOD FOR EXAMINATION OF THE EQUIPMENT BEFORE EXPLOSION?

4. STOESSEL SID IN RESPONSE TO FIRST QUESTION, THAT US PREPARED TO AGREE THAT HOST PARTY COULD RETURN FAMILIARIZATION EQUIPMENT 90 DAYS BEFORE BEGINNING OF EMPLACEMENT. WITH RESPECT TO SECOND QUESTION, THE SEISMIC EQUIPMENT WOULD ENCOMPASS ALL PARTS OF EQUIPMENT. WITH RESPECT TO THIRD QUESTION, SITE OF EXPLOSION WQS SPECIFIED BECAUSE THAT APPROPRIATE PLACE TO DEMONSTRATE WORKING OF EQUIPMENT. THE DEMONSTRATION WAS TO ASSURE HOST PARTY BOTH SETS ARE IDENTICAL AND WORK EQUALLY WELL. WITH RESPECT TO OTHER QUESTIONS, NEW ELEMENT OF CHOICE BETWEEN TWO SETS OF EQUIPMENT OBIATES NEED FOR A DETAILED EXAMINATION OF THE WORKING SETS OF EQUIPMENT.

5. MOROKHOV SAID THEY WOULD ACCEPT US PROPOSAL THAT FAMILIARIZATION EQUIPMENT WOULD BE RETURNED BY HOST PARTY 90 DAYS BEFORE BEGINNING OF EMPLACEMENT AND

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MOSCOW 02537 191717Z

ACCEPTED UNDERSTANDING ON SEISMIC EQUIPMENT. MOROKHOV ASKED FOR FURTHER EXPLANATION WITH RESPECT TO HIS FIFTH QUESTION. STOESSEL REPEATED THAT ELEMENT OF CHOICE IN SELECTION OF WORKING SET, AND OBSERVATION BY PERSONNEL OF HOST PARTY OBIATED NEED FOR RETENTION OF EQUIPMENT AFTER EXPLOSION BY HOST PARTY. THIS WAS FOLLOWED BY EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION ON THIS POINT. MOROKHOV EMPHASIZED NEED TO RETAIN EQUIPMENT AFTER

EXPLOSION BY HOST PARTY AND SAID THIS WAS UNCONDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR THEM. MOROKHOV SAID THIS ACTION CONFIRMED THEIR WORST FEARS REGARDING DESIRE TO US TO GAIN UNWARRANTED INFORMATION. SPECIFICALLY, HE SAID MEMORY DEVICES COULD BE INSERTED INTO RECORDING EQUIPMENT TO OBTAIN INFORMATION NOT RELATED TO EXPLOSIONS, WHICH DEVICES COULD BE RECOVERED ANY TIME AFTER EXPLOSION. THEIR EXAMINATION WAS DESIGNED TO DETECT OR ELIMINATE ANY SUCH INFORMATION STORED IN THE EQUIPMENT. HE COMPLAINED US HAD NOT PROVIDED EXPLANATION FOR US POSITION AND COMPLAINED BITTERLY OF ATTITUDE OF US DELEGATION. HE ASKED IF US WERE STILL INTERESTED IN ACHIEVING AN AGREEMENT AND SAID IF US CONTINUES TO BEHAVE IN THIS FASHION PERHAPS BEST TO STOP NEGOTIATIONS. HE ASKED THAT HIS VIEWS ON THESE MATTERS BE REFERRED TO WASHINGTON.

6. SOVIET SIDE SAID THAT AS FAR AS THEY WERE CONCERNED CHOICE OF EQUIPMENT COULD BE MADE BEFORE ANY DEMONSTRATION AND, FOR EXAMPLE, AT PORT OF ENTRY. WITH RESPECT TO COMPLETE SET OF EQUIPMENT RETAINED BY HOST PARTY, THEY WERE PREPARED TO RETURN THE EQUIPMENT AFTER EXPLOSION WHEN WORKING SET TURNED OVER TO HOST PARTY.

7. BUCHHEIM (STOESSEL HAVING HAD TO LEAVE MEETING EARLY) REPLIED TO SOVIET SIDE (MOROKHOV HAD ALSO LEFT FOLLOWING ABOVE TIRADE) THAT US SOUGHT MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE AGREEMENT. FURTHER EXTENSIVE BUT INCONCLUSIVE DISCUSSION CONTINUED ON ISSUE OF WHETHER OR NOT EQUIPMENT SHOULD BE RETAINED AFTER EXPLOSION BY HOST PARTY.
STOESSEL

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY, PEACEFUL NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 19 FEB 1976
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: coburnhl
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976MOSCOW02537
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X3
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760062-0766
From: MOSCOW
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760235/aaaabefm.tel
Line Count: 146
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: coburnhl
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 06 MAY 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <06 MAY 2004 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <31 AUG 2004 by coburnhl>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: TTBT/PNE NEGOTIATIONS: REPORT OF PLENARY MEETING, FEB 19. TTBT/PNE DELEGATION MESSAGE NO 64
TAGS: PARM, US, UR
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006